THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1942. Vol. XXXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Secret of our Comprehensive Unity.

The Rev. K. L. Parry, the new Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, in a recent address to the representatives of that body at Westminster, took a new line in dealing with the much vexed question of Church Reunion. Mr. Parry maintained that were a corporate union of all the Free Churches secured — a task of no little difficulty — such a united Church would be narrower than the existing Church of England. He therefore favoured direct union of the Congregationalists with the Church of England rather than the corporate union of all the Free Churches in this country with each other prior to their uniting as a whole with the Church of England.

> 'I should rejoice to see the union of the Free Churches, but I have little hope in that direction. I am not quite convinced that it would be entirely a good thing. It cannot be disputed that the Church of England is a comprehensive Church, though what it is that holds it together I have never been able to discover. I sometimes think that if the Free Churches could discover what holds them apart, and the Anglican Church could discover what holds it together, we might find the secret of reunion.'

This fact of the comprehensive unity of the Church of England is one of immense importance, and it is worth while trying to discover the true causes of it. First there is the *spiritual* basis of Christian union. Christ summed this up in four words in the Fourth Gospel — 'One flock, one shepherd' (x, 16).[1] Personal loyalty to Christ is a bond of union which unites all Christ's fol-

[1] Bishop Westcott, in his Commentary on St. John's Gospel, writes: — 'The translation "fold" for "flock" (*ovile* for *grex*) has been most disastrous in idea and in influence.' This mistranslation was derived from the vulgate and has given support to the imperial policy of the Roman Church.

lowers. A large number of English Church people really recognize as essential to Christian union no other bond than loyalty to Christ. The Church of England may prescribe more than this, but a vast number of English Church people regard all these ecclesiastical additionals as optionals — desirable perhaps but not necessary. This spiritual basis, so widely prevalent among the educated laity in the English Church, makes that Church essentially comprehensive in spirit.

Secondly, there is the *intellectual* basis of Christian union. Bishop Creighton claimed that the mark of the English Church was its appeal to sound learning. This characteristic has been in no small measure due to the close connection which has existed for centuries between our English Church and our ancient universities. As a body our clergy have been university graduates, not seminarist students. Sound learning which unites the new with the old not only makes for continuity of thought but also for a liberality of mind which has little fear of new truth. Ignorant clergy invariably become bigoted clergy, and bigoted clergy always tend to become slaves of superstition and fanaticism and to narrow the comprehensiveness of the Church in any enlightened and progressive community.

Thirdly, the *national character* of the English Church has contributed not a little to its comprehensiveness. This national character of the English Church is due in no small measure to the Establishment which has striven—although not with entire success — to keep the Church as wide as the nation. Establishment, however, has succeeded in keeping the Church in contact with the life of the nation and so has made the Church one of the greatest of our national institutions.

Establishment has endowed the Church throughout the length and breadth of the land with magnificent public buildings to which vast congregations flock on great national occasions. It has given the clergy an official status which promotes their intercourse with men of every degree belonging to every Christian denomination or none. Such social contacts ought to promote a spirit of comprehensive unity in the Church's officials, and it has certainly done so in many cases. But what perhaps is most important of all, Establishment prevents the Church from being dominated by any single Church party within it, whether Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical or Modernist, and so prevents that narrowing of the Church's power of appeal to Christians of many different types who are still enabled to find in our Church a spiritual home although they are perhaps sometimes surprised that some of their Church brothers and sisters seem to be equally at home under the same roof. Establishment secures this by the Crown appointing to all the

chief offices in the Church clergymen who are selected irrespective of the Church party to which they belong.

J. R. Green, the English historian, saw in the appointment of Bishops by the Crown *acting through the Prime Minister* the spirit of modern democracy here united to the ancient and inherent right of the laity to elect their Church's rulers. Thus Establishment is a very important factor in maintaining the comprehensive unity of the Church as well as being one of her strong bulwarks against her two greatest enemies, Secularism and Romanism.

A fourth factor in the comprehensiveness of the English Church is its *Book of Common Prayer*. It is customary to dwell on its extraordinary literary felicity, but even more remarkable is the wealth of its devotional expression. It unites in embracing harmony the noblest products of Primitive, Catholic, and Reformed devotional expression. The lover of Christian piety and of the English tongue can find in its pages the most perfect expression of his inmost spiritual needs and aspirations. The English Prayer Book, like the Authorised Version of the Bible, has not only united English Churchmen of every school, but has given to all who have come under its influence the sense of being 'in a large room'—as the Psalmist phrases it—which has unconsciously reacted upon the religious outlook of the Church's worshippers, whether simple or cultured. The wide range of our Church's hymnody has also powerfully contributed to this effect. This extends to our great centres of Church music which have been created and developed under the influence of our English Liturgy.

The fifth factor in the comprehensive unity of our Church is the character of its *doctrinal* basis. This doctrinal basis is primarily Scriptural and is thus laid down in Article VI:

> Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

The ancient creeds used in the Church's services and all other doctrinal formularies are only to be accepted in so far as they can be 'proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' The revised form of subscription, necessitated by the difficulties which the new learning was creating for the teachers of the old faith in the second half of the nineteenth century, demands no more than a general assent to the Church's doctrine as a whole. It does not demand a literal acceptance of any particular doctrinal statement.

Writing of the Amended Subscription Act of 1864, Dean Stanley states that by it there was substituted for all the old forms

of subscription

> 'a declaration as bare and general as it was possible to be, consistently with the retention of any expression of assent at all' (*Essays in Church and State,* New Edition, 1884, p. 158).

This doctrinal liberalism, by enabling men of wide learning and modern outlook to receive Holy Orders conscientiously, has made an important contribution to the comprehensive unity of our Church.

The sixth factor in our Church's comprehensiveness arises from the *character of its ministry* which is both Catholic and Evangelical. According to 'the judicious Hooker' the historic episcopate, although of the *bene esse* of the Church, is not of its *esse*. This is the right interpretation, though it is not accepted by some of our less 'judicious' clergy and laity. Our Church does not regard the historic episcopate as essential for a valid Christian Ministry. The historic episcopate is retained because of its practical worth.

In sub-apostolic times, Episcopacy was developed to meet the needs of ecclesiastical administration, and it has never lost its value in that field. It also was an outward demonstration of the continuity of Church life and witnessed to the strength and authority which the sense of historic continuity confers, especially in times of stress and strain; but the value of Episcopacy for ministerial purposes pales in comparison with the gifts which the Holy Spirit can confer on the Church's Ministers. Hence what the Church of England demands as primary and essential for a valid Christian Ministry is the presence and power of the Holy Spirit —the Spirit's call and the Spirit's fruits manifest in the character and conduct of the Ministers. The first question put by the ordaining Bishop to the candidate for Holy Orders is not 'Do you believe that Episcopal Ordination is needful for a valid Christian Ministry?'—that question is never asked at all; but

> 'Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of his glory, and the edifying of his people?'

This English conception of the Christian Ministry constitutes a link between the English Church and the ancient historic Churches of Christendom on the one hand, and with the modern evangelical Churches on the other. No conception of the Christian Ministry is better fitted to promote the Spirit of comprehensive unity.

The great majority of educated Church people have no complaint against the constitution of their Church. Their grievances, when they have any, are for the most part with the officials who seem to them to misinterpret and misrepresent our Church's true

character. Then the laity show their dissatisfaction: not by public or personal protest: not by joining any other Church: but by silent desertion, and that not in any spirit of schism but with the vague hope that in more congenial circumstances they may be drawn back to the Church again. This spirit is reflected in Henry Sidgwick's pathetic parody of the concluding lines of Tennyson's 'Palace of Art':

> O pull not down her Minster Towers
> Which are so beautifully wonderfully wrought.
> Perchance I may return with others there
> When she has purged her thought.

Mr. Parry Returns to the Charge.

The Rev. K. L. Parry, in his address to the Congregationalist Union having asked what is the secret of the comprehensive unity of the Church of England, proceeded in a letter to the *Times* of May 26 to suggest possible answers:

> 'Suppose the Church of England were to abandon Episcopacy. The Anglo-Catholics would certainly leave it. But would the Evangelicals and the Modernists? It is not so certain. But suppose the Church of England became disestablished. The Anglo-Catholics would shed no tears. But what would happen to the Evangelicals and the Modernists? If the Anglo-Catholics were strong enough to commit the Church to a high Sacramentarian doctrine and practice, or a more rigid insistence upon orthodoxy, would the Evangelicals or the Modernists remain? From which it appears that neither the Episcopacy nor the Establishment hold the Church of England together, but both.
>
> Would the Episcopate without the Establishment hold the Church together? We can only point the direction in which the answer seems to lie. There is a type of prelacy against which history warns us that it is more often the cause of disunion than of unity. But a "constitutional and representative" Episcopate which has been widely accepted as the basis of a united Church would provide that principle of coherence which is now shared by a form of State control which the Free Churches could never accept, and an Episcopate which is still prelatical in form—though it has almost ceased to be so in spirit.'

We believe that a 'constitutional and representative' Episcopacy would be incapable by itself of doing for the Church of England what establishment does for that Church. Not only is it impossible to secure agreement to-day in the Church of England as to the character and powers of a 'constitutional and representative' Episcopate, but all branches of the English Church which are governed or claim to be governed by such an Episcopate possess a less comprehensive unity than does the Church of England. For instance, in South Africa the Anglican Communion is narrowly Anglo-Catholic: in New South Wales, rigidly Evangelical. We see the same at home. In Ireland, the Anglican Church is Evangelical: in Wales and Scotland, it is Anglo-Catholic. Indeed,

such comprehensiveness as these Churches possess is due much more to their relations with the Church of England than to their own constitution and government.

When Mr. Parry asserts that the Free Churches could never accept State control as we now have it in the Church of England, we could wish that he would give further consideration to this point, for much turns on it. Every institution in a modern State, if it seeks incorporation for the purpose of holding property, must be subject to State control. Such State control has to be exercised in the interests of the nation as a whole. All that we as Christians can reasonably demand is that State control should be of such a kind as to protect the true interests of the institution and at the same time restrict the institution from infringing the constitutional and legal rights of other institutions. Every religious denomination in this land is subject to this State control. The State control exercised over the Church of England has these ends in view, but the Church of England being the National Church, the State control assumes in her case several different forms, but not one of these when carefully studied can be shown to be detrimental to the Church's welfare or to restrict her beneficial freedom of action.

If the House of Commons refused to legalize the Deposited Book in 1927-28, it was because that book was held by some M.P.'s to undermine the Reformation Settlement which is the basis of Church Establishment, and was held by other M.P.'s to be in opposition to the wishes of the great majority of the English laity who preferred the older Prayer Book of 1662, and whose only mode of effective protest against Episcopal domination in this matter was by an appeal to the verdict of the House of Commons.

We have already referred to J. R. Green's conviction that the appointment of bishops by the Crown acting on the advice of the Prime Minister preserved the ancient right of the laity to elect their own bishops. Addis and Arnold in their *Catholic Dictionary* (privileged by the *Imprimatur*) point out that in the appointment of bishops in Roman Catholic countries even the Papacy has recognized the right of the State to share in making such appointments (see Article on Bishops, p. 86). We wonder if Mr. Parry and his fellow Free Churchmen have weighed carefully the effect on our British Constitution of the abolition of the existing relations between Church and State.

The Church of England is not only a creation of the Christian Religion, but it is also a creation of the political genius of the English people. What is needed to-day is not Disestablishment, but that the Church should be true to itself and should develop in accordance with its inherent genius. This development might well lead to such a broadening of the Establishment as would enable

our Church to include within it the great Free Churches without requiring them to surrender those religious convictions which brought them into existence. Certainly no true development of the Church of England should aim at Disestablishment, which is as essential to the Church's welfare as it is to that of the nation.

The Revival of the Sub-Diaconate.

A motion to appoint a committee to consider the revival of the sub-diaconate was passed by a large majority in the recent session of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. In view of the growing reactionary movement among the English clergy, this proposal should cause no surprise, although it may create misgiving.

It is doubtful if one in a hundred of the English laity has ever heard of a sub-deacon, and if one in ten thousand of the laity could define his office and functions. The sub-diaconate has not existed in the Church of England since the Reformation. Our English Ordinal, while providing for 'making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons' which 'orders of Ministers' have existed 'from the Apostles' time in Christ's Church' makes no mention whatsoever of sub-deacons, and that because sub-deacons are of much later origin than Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

The earliest mention of sub-deacons would seem to be in a letter of Bishop Cornelius of Rome written some time after 254 A.D. In this letter he states that the Church of Rome possesses seven sub-deacons. It is probable therefore that sub-deacons are of Roman origin and certainly of Western origin. In the Church, they secured great authority and performed important functions.

> 'The lettters of St. Gregory the Great, who sent Augustine to convert the English, show that in his time the Roman sub-deacons administered the affairs of St. Peter's patrimony throughout the provinces, made reports to the Pope on the conduct of bishops, and by the Pope's orders admonished prelates, reformed abuses, and assembled councils' (Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, p. 779).

Those who are desirous of reviving the sub-diaconate in England do not propose to empower our English sub-deacons to report on the conduct of bishops or to admonish prelates, for these are now the functions of the English Press. The sub-deacon of later times in the Western Church was a species of super-server attending to the Eucharistic vessels who was subsequently permitted to read the Epistle at the Mass. For some centuries, he was not ordained by imposition of episcopal hands, but was appointed to his office merely by the 'tradition of the instruments' which consisted in handing him an empty chalice and paten with cruet and

towel. Later, however, sub-deacons were ordained by the Bishop, and the sub-diaconate became one of the three great Orders of the Latin Church—which, by the way, regards the Bishop as belonging to the Order of Priests (*primus inter pares*), not as constituting a separate order which is our English way of classifying the episcopate.

Why, then, is it proposed to revive the sub-diaconate in the Church of England? In the Roman Catholic Church a priest, a deacon and a sub-deacon are necessary for the full ceremonial celebration of High Mass. Hence the growing body of English clergy who desire in every way to approximate our English Communion Service to the Roman Mass naturally feel a need for the revival of the sub-diaconate. This revival English Churchmen who do not wish to see our English Services Romanised must feel compelled to oppose.

It is not, however, surprising that this preliminary effort to revive an ecclesiastical office which in the English Church has been dead for 400 years should follow upon the recent effort to approximate the order of our Holy Communion office to that of the mediaeval Mass—a movement which was happily checked, if not finally rejected, at the recent session of the Canterbury Convocation.

Co-ordination Frustrated in Convocation.

In the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, on May 20th, Prebendary Boggis of Exeter moved

> 'That the bishops be respectfully requested to consider whether the co-ordaining of candidates for the Ministry would provide a solution of the reunion problem.'

In moving his resolution, Prebendary Boggis referred with keen appreciation to the increasingly friendly feelings developing between Anglicans and Free Churchmen; but these friendly interchanges, he maintained, do not constitute what is the real need of our national Christianity, and that is reunion based on intercommunion. Reunion requires a common Ministry, and a common partaking of 'the Sacrament of Unity.'

He believed that this common Ministry could be secured by the co-ordaining of future candidates for the Ministry, whether Anglican or Free Church, by a bishop and a Free Church leader acting together in the laying-on of hands. In view of its history, the Church of England could not be expected to abandon the practice of episcopal ordination, nor, on the other hand, could non-episcopally ordained ministers in the Free Churches be expected to submit to a second Ordination to be conferred by episcopal

hands. Such a second Ordination would seem to many to be a public denial by Free Churchmen of the validity of their first Ordination.

Prebendary Boggis' proposal had in view the near future rather than the immediate present. If co-ordination were practised, all Anglican clergymen and Free Church ministers henceforth ordained in this country would share the same Holy Orders with Apostolic Succession; and, when invited to do so, might not only preach in each other's pulpits, but also celebrate in each other's churches. Prebendary Boggis declared that in advocating this important step towards reunion he did not expect, or even desire, to secure uniformity. What he longed for was unity, and a unity which would exhibit its power both in the foreign mission field and in the home land.

The resolution was seconded by Canon Bax of Birmingham. He claimed that the need for action was urgent and that true prayer ought to be accompanied by action. The need for post-war planning in this matter was obvious. The times were ripe for action, and it would be most disastrous if the opportunity were allowed to slip and nothing done.

It is painful to have to record that, in the words of the *Guardian*, after a brief discussion, the resolution was 'rejected by an almost unanimous vote.' We wonder why a proposal so judicious and Christian should not be acceptable to the Church of England. Is it because it might prejudice the validity of our English Orders in the eyes of continental Christians? If this be the real reason for the rejection, it discredits the claim of the English Church to constitute a potential bond of union between the ancient episcopal Churches on the one hand and the non-episcopal Reformed Churches on the other. In this matter the world-wide influence of the Church of England demands that it should lead, and that without delay.

The New Ecclesiastical Front.

On May 28, Dr. Fisher, Bishop of London, announced in a broadcast that the Church of England, the Free Churches and the Roman Catholic Church in England had agreed upon 'such a measure of joint action as has not happened in this country since the Reformation.' Were Archbishop Sancroft alive, and the six other English bishops who accompanied him to the Tower in the days of James II, they might feel some alarm at this announcement and judge that it heralded their passage through the Traitors' Gate for the second time. Should they view the Bishop of London's announcement in this way, they would be grievously misinterpreting it.

What has happened is that the 'Religion and Life' movement, representing the Church of England and the Free Churches, has agreed to co-operate with the 'Sword of the Spirit' movement, which represents the Roman Catholic Church in this country, and this co-operation is to be effected by means of a Standing Committee consisting of representatives of both groups. This co-operation is not concerned with Church affairs, but with the moral, social, economic and political condition of the nation.

Miss Barbara Ward, the prophetess of the *Sword of the Spirit* movement, has clearly defined in the *Spectator* of May 29 the character and scope of this new ecclesiastical combine :

> 'This structure—which roughly resembles a letter H, with the *Sword of the Spirit* and *Religion and Life* as the parallel lines, and the Joint Committee as the crosspiece—mirrors the realities and the possibilities of the situation : no dogmatic or religious compromise on the one hand, full and generous co-operation in the sphere of the civic order on the other. Does this mean an impoverishment of the work before Christians in this country, a preoccupation with purely secular issues, a failure to make a specifically Christian contribution? Surely not. The main work of the two parallel movements will be to quicken the religious life of the Christian community, to make Christian souls realise their heavy responsibility in an age in which fire and power and dynamism have passed to the enemies of God. The leaders of the movements know that the work of the Joint Councils will be superficial and transitory unless their members come to their task fired with a new enthusiasm and a new responsibility — which only a deepening of their religious life can give.'

The influence which such a movement can exert must depend upon the support which our ecclesiastical leaders receive from their laity. We may be sure that the Cardinal and the Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country will see to it that their laity support them in this movement, but it will require much strenuous propaganda on the part of the Church of England and the Free Churches to secure the influential support of any large proportion of their laity, since the laity of these Churches prefer in social, economic and political issues, to operate not through their clergy but through their civic and political representatives.

If this movement can inspire the citizens of this country, in so far as they need such inspiration—for many of them are already good Christian men — with the conviction that they must work to make our civilization primarily a Christian civilization and not merely a materialistic success, it will have achieved much. It is, however, the laity who must lead here, and that in their council chambers and places of business. It is not a clerical but a lay movement that we need; and it ought not to be forgotten that all our chief measures of social amelioration and political reform in this country have been initiated and carried through by laymen.

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., F.B.A., K.C.V.O.

WHEN this Society was founded, there was a discussion about its name. Should it be called the Modern Churchmen's Union or the Liberal Churchmen's Union? The decision was I think unfortunate. The word Modern means nothing. We are all modern, whether we like it or no, though a cynic might say that there is nothing so reactionary as being up to date. Lenin was modern; Mussolini is modern; Hitler is very modern indeed. But the word Liberal has a meaning, and it means what we stand for. We believe that our Lord came to make us free, and that if He makes us free, we shall be free indeed. In that liberty we mean to stand fast. We know that every institution tends to strangle the ideas which gave it birth, and that the Christian Church is no exception. In reading the New Testament, we can trace the tentative and mutually inconsistent Christologies — the speeches in the *Acts*, the conflict of Rabbinism and Hellenism in St. Paul's Epistles, the victory of the Logos-Christology in *Hebrews* and the Fourth Gospel. Then follow the long debates, the heresies and schisms, closed at last by the heavy hand of authority. After the Dark Ages we have the brilliant attempt of St. Thomas Aquinas to find room for a half-Platonised Aristotelianism in Christianity. Then came the Reformation, with Calvinism as a Christianized Stoicism, and schools of Christian Platonists in this country. Some of these debates were futile; some led to blind alleys; but throughout Church history liberty has been the sign of life, authority of stagnation and death.

About twenty years ago a pervert to Roman Catholicism taunted our society by saying that its members were most of them 'about sixty.' Those of them who are still alive are now about eighty, and we have lived to see the sinister truth of that taunt. Liberalism and liberty are out of fashion. In philosophy we have had the doctrine of pragmatism, that Truth has no meaning except what suits us; there is no such thing as absolute truth or beauty or goodness. In history we have Oswald Spengler arguing that by ineluctable necessity we are entering upon a period of 'Caesarism.' 'World-history,' he remarks at the end of his book, 'has always sacrificed truth and justice to might and race, and passed doom of death upon peoples to whom truth was more than deeds and justice than power.' Here was Plato's Thrasymachus

* A Sermon preached in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, W.C.2., at the Annual Meeting of the Modern Churchman's Union, on June, 3rd, 1942.

parading his blasphemies nearly twenty years before Hitler came into power. In the totalitarian States we see liberalism and liberty openly derided and trampled on. Thinkers who will not prostitute their intellects to diffuse any lie that the government orders them to tell are persecuted, imprisoned, tortured, shot. And Germany, once the spiritual home of philosophy, scholarship, music, and poetry, either loves to have it so or is too much cowed to protest. Liberty and truth are not merely violated in practice; for the first time in history they are repudiated in principle.

We may look nearer home. The ignominious position of the Liberal party is not at all a case of the moderate body squeezed out between the two extremes. The two great parties are now not far apart; they are rival bidders for the favour of the electorate. Liberalism is out of favour because our generation has lost faith in reason, in freedom, and in truth. Consider this passage from Mills' famous essay on Liberty:

> 'Let us suppose that the government is entirely at one with the people and never thinks of exerting any power of coercion unless in agreement with what it conceives to be their voice. I deny the right of the people to exercise such coercion, either by themselves or by their government. The power itself is illegitimate. The best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion than when in opposition to it. If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.'

If this sounds extravagant, and it probably does, that is only a measure of the extent to which, as General Smuts says, the standard of freedom has fallen below that of the nineteenth century. There is to-day, he says (he was not speaking in war-time), less freedom in Europe than there has been during the last two thousand years. Carlyle's eternal verities are relegated to his limbo of old clothes. Although individual freedom, individual independence of mind, are essential to all true progress, the sturdy individualism which inspired progress in the past, which has created all our best human values, is decaying in the confusion and disillusion of our day. In their misery and helplessness men are surrendering to the mass will which leads straight to tyranny. A servile standardized mass-mentality is the greatest danger of our time. Intellectual freedom is disappearing with political freedom. Even religious persecution, long considered obsolete, has again raised its hideous head.

Even Science—all-conquering infallible Science—has lost faith in its own principles. I am not competent to form any opinion about the physical theory of relativity, which its discoverer Einstein wishes to keep out of philosophy. But the victory of

relativism in science is plain for all to see. There are now to be no laws of nature. For most purposes it is convenient to believe in Newton's law of gravitation, to say that parallel straight lines cannot meet, and that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; but if we choose to deny it, we are not wrong; Riemann will help us. Our astronomers start with a rather naive realism — stars and atoms are objectively real as we know them, and end with an outmoded Berkeleyan idealism, leaving an obvious hiatus between premise and conclusion. We hear much of laws which are only statistical averages, of the fallacy of causation, even of chance in nature.

I need not point out the connexion of relativism with loss of liberty. If there are no things which we would die rather than do, no lies which we would die rather than tell, no foulness which we would die rather than call fair — if, in a word, there are no absolute values which stand in their own right, the revelation of the mind of God Himself, Freedom lies bleeding; there is no one to defend her.

And what of religion in our time? I say nothing of the political Churchmen, whom we have always with us. Many of us have read Huxley's tragical life of the 'Eminence Grise,' Richelieu's adviser, a saint who became a Machiavelli. But what is the significance of the startling fact that a dozen well-known men and women of letters have lately not only professed themselves Christians, but have embraced the most uncompromising form of Christianity? It could not have happened fifty years ago; most of them would have called themselves agnostics. Ought we to be thankful that the materialism of the last century has so far receded that no one is now ashamed to be a believer? To some extent, yes; but I am not very happy about it. For Roman Catholicism is Fascism in religion; it appeals to the same type of mind which swells the ranks of Hitler's and Mussolini's followers. The same thing has happened in France; the Spanish and French Fascists are nearly all Catholics. Santayana speaks of 'post-rational religion.' We remember Pascal's famous saying that the heart has reasons which the intellect knows not of. But the heart cannot reason; it can only make-believe. The attractions of this kind of religion, and of this kind of politics, are too obvious to need enumerating; but it kills liberty, it kills toleration, it kills humanity. It is not the faith of the New Testament and of the early Church. Faith is the resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis. It is an experiment which ends in an experience, and it leads to knowledge, to *gnosis* as Clement is not afraid to call it, to an intellectual conviction, based on the spiritual enlightenment which the life of faith has brought with it. Love, which 'unites the knower and the known,' is the crown and goal of the quest. I do not for a moment

wish to question the motives or to regret the happiness of those who have found peace and satisfaction in that venerable Church. But from our point of view as Liberal Churchmen I fear it is not a very encouraging symptom of the trend of present-day thought. Do you remember Newman's definition of education, as understood by a Catholic? To pour truth into the mind, and seal it up in perpetuity?

Are we to agree with Spengler that we are in for a long period of 'Caesarism,' of despotism and oppression, in which the sun of our 'culture' must set in a dreary 'civilization'? It is just possible, but I do not believe it. The spirit of nationalism, so much stronger than it was when it baffled Napoleon, will prevent any aggressive Power from holding Europe in chains. The love of freedom, the brightest vision perhaps that has ever dawned upon humanity, will rise from its grave and expel the tyrants with their whips and prisons and secret police. We in England *could* not be enslaved. Does not our heart burn within us when we read the praises of freedom in Shakespeare, Burke, Wordsworth, and others of our great writers? Cannot we hear good Queen Bess saying to her people:

> 'Let tyrants fear; I have always so behaved myself that under God I have placed my chiefest safeguard in the loyal hearts and goodwill of my subjects; and therefore I am come among you as you see at this time, not for my recreation and disport, but being resolved in the midst and heat of the battle to live or die amongst you all, to lay down for my God and for my kingdoms and for my people, my honour and my blood even in the dust. I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and a King of England too.'

Our care is for intellectual rather than for political freedom, though in fact the two stand or fall together. What should be the chief work of our Society in the troubled years that lie before us? I think I see now more clearly than I did thirty years ago, that faith must speak in its own language, and that the language of faith contains an element of symbol, of poetry, of myth if you will. We most of us need a bridge to take us across from the seen to the unseen, from the world of fact to the world of value, from the temporal to the eternal, express it how we will. The Church must provide for the needs of all believers, whose mental requirements are as different as the spectacles which we need to help us to see and read, different spectacles for almost everyone, and not the same for the old as for the young. These symbols are not the creators of faith, as rationalists and traditionalists both aver; they are the products of faith, which could never really be built upon them. The use of a bridge is to take us across. There are many who do not wish to cross; they 'mind earthly things' only. There may be some — saints and mystics — who are content to remain on the further side. But most of us need a bridge. Plato knew

that philosophers need a bridge too; that is why he made his myths. The danger of traditionalism is that it insists on everyone using the same bridge, which is useless for many people. Institutional churches cater for the half-educated and the half-converted. Our business as Liberal Churchmen is not to tell traditionalists that their bridge is untrustworthy, but to see that those who need another bridge are not prevented from using it. Much has been done in our Church to meet this need, partly, I venture to think, by the efforts of our members, who were not afraid of being branded as heretics and disloyal Churchmen. But much remains to be done. In particular, our Sunday services do not appeal to our young people. Are we not sometimes ashamed to have to read the Old Testament lessons? Are not many of the psalms either unintelligible or plainly sub-Christian? Are matins and evensong really the best that we can do in this way? And the training in most of the theological colleges — is it satisfactory? Does it not sometimes encourage the wrong kind of professionalism? Ought we not to do much more to teach our young clergymen their main business, that of physicians of the soul? And our relations with the Free Churches — they have improved very greatly, but is there not room for further improvement? Ought we not to set ourselves firmly against false and unhistorical theories of the apostolical succession? In matters of belief, cannot we tell our people that they are not obliged to believe the ascension, and the resurrection of the flesh, in the literal sense? These surely are bridges which for most people no longer serve their purpose.

We have no wish to lay the foundations of a new orthodoxy, but only to gain freedom for earnest Christians to formulate some of their beliefs in their own way. For many men who would have liked to be clergymen and who would have brought strength to the Church are deterred by the traditional dogmas which they suppose that they must accept. We should, I think, make the foundations of our teaching the testimony of the Holy Spirit, what the Quakers call the inner light, and the acceptance of the Christian standard of values. The latter is in some ways easier to preach than it used to be; for the over-estimate of the value of money, encouraged by the great prizes which the last century offered to success in business, is no longer nearly so common among us. Plain living will be forced upon the next generation, and I think it quite possible that there may be a revival of communal life, as in the old monasteries, for some of both sexes who may wish to withdraw from life in the world, and for elderly people who may wish to end their days in quiet meditation, as is not uncommon in India. These are only suggestions for the future activities of the Society, which I am sure has not outlived its usefulness. We must not mind being told that liberalism and liberty are out of date. In due season we shall reap if we faint not.

THE VATICAN AND THE WAR

By the Rev. Gamaliel Milner, M.A., author of *The Problem of Decadence.*

'*L'A Cléricalisme—voilà l'ennemi,*' said Gambetta in the 'seventies. His words are generally understood in this country to mean simply that he did not like priests and monks and did not believe in the Catholic religion. Very likely he did feel like that, but as a practical politician he would not have offered a wanton insult to the majority of his countrymen. When he said that Clericalism was the enemy, he meant that it was the enemy of what he would probably have called the ideals of 1789, and what we should now call Democracy. He meant also that the clericals were the enemies of France in so far as they tended to put loyalty to the Church above loyalty to their country. Many of his opponents would have agreed with him; they would have admitted that they did hate the Revolution and all its works, that they did think the interests of the Church paramount.

If Gambetta were alive to-day, he would say that the men of Vichy represented the same party who had conspired with the coalition of German princes in 1792, who had risen in the West to help the invaders in 1793, who in 1814 had welcomed the entry of the allied troops into Paris with hysterical demonstrations of joy and cries of '*Vive l'Empereur Alexandre*! *Vive le Roi de Prusse*! *A bas le tyran* (Napoleon)!' 'Why haven't you come before?' asked an enthusiastic royalist lady of Alexander. 'I should have been here sooner,' replied the Emperor, weary of unpatriotic sycophants, 'if it had not been for certain of your countrymen.'

Thucydides says that simplicity is the mark of a noble mind but ruinous in times of revolution. The Report of the Malvern Conference displays the quintessence of this quality when it welcomes with effusion the ambidextrous peace proposals put forth by the Pope. Where your treasure is, there shall your heart be also: by the agreement made in 1926 between Mussolini and the Papacy the Holy See received 750,000,000 lire paid down together with the interest on 1,000,000,000 lire in State bonds. If the Duce goes down, all this and much more will be lost; the Papal State will hardly survive its creator. Everywhere the influence of the Vatican is being exercised to our detriment. In France the Clericals are the mainstay of the Vichy Government. In Jugo-Slavia the Church fostered the agitation of the Catholic Croats against the Orthodox Serbs. In America the radio priest, Father Coughlin, denounced England, and, had it not been for Pearl Harbour, the Isolation

Party, which relies mainly on the Irish, Italian and other Catholic elements, would probably have succeeded in keeping the United States out of the war. Spain, where the Clerical Party is now triumphant, is for the present non-belligerent; she does not pretend to be neutral; all the sympathies of the dominant party are with Germany and Italy, who helped them with arms and volunteers in the civil war. To come nearer home, to Catholic Ireland, here is what a well-known American journalist reports from Dublin to the *American Mercury* (December, 1941):

> 'The Swastika and Fascist tricolor wave with defiant persistence over German and Italian legations in Dublin, but the Union Jack is absent. In fact there is no British Minister in Eire, only a British Representative, who moves about in restricted circles and is rarely present at official functions. The Government press prints the Axis war communiqués before the British. The Irish radio is free to criticize England, but no word may be broadcast against the Axis. German films are shown in Dublin theatres, but *British War News* and even *March of Time* are invariably banned by the Censor.'

Such is Catholic Dublin under what the writer calls 'Eire's Prime-Ministerial mystic, Eamon de Valera.' Mr. Andrews, the head of the Northern Ireland Government, complains that the refusal of the Free States ports to the British Navy has resulted in the loss of thousands of valuable lives. Northern Ireland has had to acquiesce in de Valera's fiat that there must be no conscription there, lest compulsion to serve in the British Army should be applied to the half-million or so Catholics. A glance at the names of the Roman hierarchy in our Asiatic and African possessions is instructive: out of a hundred prelates those with English or Scottish names can be counted almost, if not quite, on the fingers of one hand.

We do not, of course, mean to imply that there is anything criminal in the Pope's detached attitude towards the British Empire. If we deny the Petrine claims and the donation of Constantine, the Pope may with equal reason question the validity of the alleged donation of the ends of the earth to Great Britain by the God of our Fathers, known of old. To men reared among the tombs of the Caesars and the palaces of the Renaissance Popes, the British Empire must seem a very pinchbeck affair.

Nor do we think that the general tendency toward the Right in politics displayed by the Vatican at all inexplicable. Broadly speaking, since the French Revolution the Catholic Church has been on the side of the kings and the aristocrats. The fact stands out on every page of the history of the nineteenth century. Only in those areas, such as Ireland or Poland, where the Catholics are under heretical or schismatic domination has the Church played with revolutionary forces.

True to the traditions of Vatican diplomacy, Pius XV would prefer an Axis victory in Europe to an Anglo-Soviet triumph. Mindful of the uncertainty of war, he endeavours to keep a foothold in both camps; he remembers how often in the nineteenth century the Papacy had the misfortune to back a loser, and he sees the necessity of hedging. Perhaps on the whole a compromise peace would be most consonant with the interests of the Church. From the Ark of Christ's Church a wandering dove is occasionally sent out to search among the howling waters for an olive branch.

Profound misunderstanding exists in this country about the relations of Hitler with the Catholic Church. In Catholic countries before and after the Reformation a state of tension, leading to occasional friction, between Church and State was normal; the excommunication of an emperor or king by the Pope was a common incident of mediaeval life; it was the lot not only of the reckless John but of successful rulers like Philip Augustus, Frederic Barbarossa and Robert Bruce. Occasionally, as in the case of Henry IV, an emperor died excommunicate; sometimes, as in the case of Hildebrand, a Pope died in exile; usually a peace was patched up. The Church is very tolerant to successful sinners and will accept a reasonable modicum of repentance. Bismarck sent bishops to prison by the score in the *kultur-kampf*, but before he died he had the honour of being the one and only Protestant to receive at the Pope's hands the Order of Christ.

The opportunism of the Church, its disregard of the ordinary rules of morality where its corporate interests were concerned, used to be a stumbling-block to the ordinary layman. He could not understand why men who in their personal lives were models of austere and self-sacrificing piety should seem colour-blind in matters of conduct where the supposed interests of God and His Church were concerned. Perhaps it is not so hard to understand now; ideology has invaded politics, and ideology is a new-fangled word for religion. Anything is permissible for the good of the Party. *Tantum Religio potuit suadere malorum.*

France has been the home of Clericalism, and of its ugly counterpart, anti-Clericalism. It is a little difficult for an Englishman to understand either. He was puzzled by the fact that in a country where the population seemed to be ardently Catholic the anti-Clericals were always in office. He was astonished in June, 1940, when France, of whose patriotism he had heard so much, collapsed, and his astonishment deepened into utter bewilderment when he found leading politicians actively collaborating with the Nazis. The explanation lies in the deep rift in the French soul, in the suspicion at the back of every Frenchman's mind that it is impossible to be a good Catholic and a good Frenchman.

The leaders of French Clericalism have not generally been clerics, or even particularly devout laymen. On the other hand, anti-Clericals are not always anti-Catholic at heart; they often encourage their wives to go to Mass and send their daughters to Convent schools. But ever since the Revolution there has been a latent, and at some times an open, antagonism between those who put country first and those who care most for the rights of the Church.

When the States General met in 1789, there seemed at first no antagonism between Clergy and Laity. The bishops sided with the aristocracy, the representatives of the clergy with the *Tiers Etat*. The rift began with the Civil Constitution of the clergy. On the face of it the scheme drawn up for the French Church seemed reasonable enough; as in contemporary England, far too much of the Church's wealth was going to the bishops and capitular clergy and far too little to the parish priests; it was proposed that there should be fewer bishops with smaller salaries. Bishops were to be elected by the departments, *curés* by the communes. But the reforms, however defensible in themselves, were felt to be an invasion of the rights of the Church. There was a suspicion, not without foundation, that certain leaders of the Constituent Assembly, imbued with the fashionable philosophy, were seeking a quarrel with the Catholic Church. Anyhow, the Pope condemned the Civil Constitution. The opponents of the Revolution, the old privileged orders, felt that for the first time there was a real body of public opinion behind them.

The sequel is well known: the harsh law which sentenced to perpetual banishment priests who refused to take the oath of fidelity to the Civil Constitution, the murders of the *prêtres insermentés*, the blasphemous mummeries in Nôtre Dame when the Goddess of Reason was enthroned on the altar, the Reign of Terror—rather a mild affair judged by twentieth century standards, but sufficiently horrible to persons reared in the mild atmosphere of the eighteenth.

That is one side, the horrors of the French Revolution, familiar to every Englishman. The other side is that France was invaded by the armies of the German Princes summoned to their aid by priests and aristocrats, who, just when the danger from the foreigner was at its height, began a Catholic revolt in the West. In our modern jargon, the *Emigrés* and Vendeans were Quislings and Fifth Columnists.

To write the story of the relations between Church and State in France since the Revolutionary Era would be to write the history of France. Every Government — Royalist, Imperialist, Republican — has been confronted with the eternal enigma, Can

a good Frenchman be a good Catholic? Yet the average Frenchman would like to be both; the feeling is shared by most French priests. In the first Great War priests fought side by side with laymen in the trenches; many of them gained military distinctions. It was hoped that the quarrel was buried with the memory of far-off unhappy things. But the spectre refused to be laid; there were too many people on both sides who wanted to keep the quarrel open. Anti-Clericalism was a part of the stock-in-trade of the Left Parties, all the more necessary because the so-called Radicals and Radical Socialists had little to offer in the way of Social Reform. And there were enemies of the Republic always at hand to exploit the irritation caused by the anti-Clerical outbursts. The civil war in Spain divided France into two camps: the Right were for Franco, the Left were for the Reds. The present writer was in what is now Vichy France in the summer of 1937 and was much struck by the anti-British tone of the Right Press and by the obvious fact that its circulation in Central France greatly exceeded that of the organs of the Left, from which our newspapers habitually quoted.

It looks as if for the second time in two centuries the Catholic Church in France, or those who claim to speak in its name, is allying itself with the foreign invader. It is a dangerous game to play.

IN MEMORIAM

MAURICE ARTHUR CANNEY

On Saturday, May 16th, by the death of Professor Maurice Canney, the Modernist cause has lost a firm supporter of many years standing. Educated at Merchant Taylors' School, London, and St. John's College, Oxford, he specialized in Semitic languages, and after a period of teaching in Germany was appointed Assistant Lecturer in Manchester University in 1910, becoming Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in 1912. From this post he retired in 1934. He succeeded Professor Hogg in 1912 as Editor of the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, only resigning in 1940.

He was a member of the editorial staff of the *Encyclopedia Biblica* from 1897 to 1903. He delivered the Ghosh Lecture on Comparative Religion at Calcutta University in 1925. He contributed to Hastings *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* and many other learned publications. He began his literary work by translations of some of the shorter essays of Schmiedel, Saltau, Holtzmann and others. His own books, *Givers of Life* (1923), *The Larger Life in Focus* (1927-28), *Newness of Life* (1928), ex-

hibited the strength and breadth of his spiritual and moral outlook, but they had not sufficient literary quality or arresting originality of thought to secure wide publicity.

Although he had graduated in the Honours School of Theology at Oxford, theological difficulties precluded his proceeding to ordination, for which in many ways he was excellently suited. A man of kindly disposition, gentle ways, academic manners, conscientious devotion to duty and really liberal mind, he strove to serve the cause of sound learning and true religion in his day and generation.

He was the son of Edward Canney, Rector of St. Peter's, Saffron Hill, whom some may remember as the originator of holidays in the country for London slum children. H.D.A.M.

HENRY BARRAN

On May 7th at Shadwell Grange, Leeds, at the age of 85, Henry Barran passed out of this mortal life. He was one of those great-hearted, large-minded laymen who have honoured the Modern Churchmen's Union by their membership. He was the fourth son of the late Sir John Barran, Bt., and the uncle of our Sir John Barran who has served the Modern Churchmen's Union as Treasurer for the last twenty years. A graduate of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and a barrister by profession, he became a great figure in the commercial, philanthropic and sporting life of Leeds.

He not only gave large sums of money to maintain or found philanthropic institutions in that progressive Yorkshire city, but also devoted to their service his great powers of administration and human sympathy. In a long obituary notice, the *Yorkshire Post* (May 8th) enumerates the chief of his public services.

> 'A large part of his life was willingly devoted to philanthropic work. Especially did the Women's and Children's Hospital appeal to him. He accepted the chairmanship of the institution in 1900, and by his personal influence greatly helped the scheme for housing it in more commodious buildings. He was indefatigable in raising funds, and had the satisfaction of seeing the new hospital rise steadily to its completion. For many years he continued to be the guiding hand of the institution, and to the last his interest in its welfare remained keen and unabated. He was also one of the oldest members of the Board of the Leeds General Infirmary, and took an especial interest in the big extension undertaken as a memorial of King Edward.'

His public services included also the University of Leeds. He was a life member of the Court, and a member of the committee which dealt with economics and commerce.

Henry Barran was also keenly interested in juvenile work, and was Vice-Chairman and Treasurer of the Leeds Y.M.C.A. Boys' Work Committee. He gave £8,000 for the building of a juvenile

community institute on the Gipton Housing Estate. He also presented playing fields to the city. His attitude towards youth was essentially understanding and genial.

> 'There are no bad boys, Parson: there are plenty of naughty boys, but no bad boys.'

He was a strong Churchman and a trustee of the famous Leeds Parish Church. He was an equally strong Modernist. The Vicar of Moor Allerton (the Rev. E. N. Giles) described him in the *Yorkshire Post* (May 9th) as possessing 'a mind given to searching for and pondering upon great truth . . . awake and alert,' citing in illustration the following passage from Thomas Carlyle:

> 'Religion in unnoticed nooks is weaving for herself new vestures wherewith to reappear, and bless us, or our sons, or grandsons.'

'Wise, eager and humble,' he combined sound judgement with courageous leadership. H.D.A.M.

JAMES GRANVILLE ADDERLEY

Prebendary the Hon. James Adderley passed away on June 1. He had been a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union for nearly thirty years. Beginning his clerical life as an Anglo-Catholic, he later found much to sympathize with in English Modernism. When he succeeded the Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy as Rector of St. Edmund the Martyr, E.C.3, he welcomed annual courses of sermons delivered in its pulpit by Liberal Churchmen.

He was a devoted parish priest and led a most strenuous and self-denying life. He was a strong believer in social reform and furthered it more by example than by precept. He held a number of pastoral charges in London and Birmingham. As a very young man he became Head of Oxford House. In 1917 he was Select Preacher before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. He became a Prebendary of St. Paul's in 1935. Grave in deportment, he possessed a strong sense of humour and dramatic and literary gifts. He wrote several small and very readable books. The two most characteristic of him are *Stephen Remarx*, 1893, and *Old Seed on New Ground*, 1920. The latter is an attempt to re-write the Gospel parables for modern readers. Perhaps he succeeded best with the Unjust Steward. In his essay on Father Dolling, contributed to a series of *Lives of Great Christians*, Adderley reveals in his appreciations and judgments much of himself.

James Adderley came of a family of loyal Church workers, a type which is not so numerous as in Victorian days. His brother, the Hon. Reginald Adderley, was also a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union. H.D.A.M.

BOOK REVIEWS

A MASTER OF THE KING'S MUSIC*

Music in England owes much to the organists of our great Cathedrals. The Cathedrals of our land are scattered in every part of the country. Each one needs an organist, and is able to attract musicians of skill and ability, who can not only maintain the music of the Cathedral on a high level, but also encourage and foster the love of good music in the Cathedral town. Our Cathedral organists have maintained and kept alive the great tradition of English church music. But they have not simply contented themselves with this. They have also encouraged and taken an active part in music making of every kind. They have trained countless numbers of pupils and taught them the love of good music. They have formed and conducted choral and orchestral societies. They have done a good work for English music. We owe a great debt to them.

Walter Parratt is a good example of the Cathedral organist. An account of his life by Donald Tovey and Geoffrey Parratt has recently been published.* Nearly three chapters were written by Sir Donald Tovey before his illness and death. It has fallen therefore to Walter Parratt's son, Geoffrey, to complete the book. He has given us a lively account, easy and entertaining to read, of his father's life and work. It is an offering of filial love and piety.

Walter Parratt spent practically the whole of his long life as a church organist. There was a Parratt tradition in music and organ playing. His father was organist of Huddersfield Parish Church. As a mere boy, the young Walter was an organist. He held his first salaried post as organist of St. Paul's, Huddersfield, at the age of thirteen. He remained there seven years, until he was persuaded to accept the position of organist of Great Witley Parish Church and private organist to the Earl of Dudley. Witley was only fifteen miles from St. Michael's College, Tenbury, where there was a full choral service as part of the daily routine. The warden of the college and vicar of the parish was Sir Frederick Gore Ouseley, Professor of Music at Oxford, who was a close friend of the Parratt family. It was largely owing to Ouseley that Parratt came to Witley and he was a constant visitor at the college. It was at Tenbury that Parratt, always a keen chess player, performed a remarkable feat of blindfold chess. He sat in a corner blindfolded and played, two good players acting in consultation on one board. Their moves were told him by word of mouth.

> 'After a few moves he said in mock misery: "It's very dull, sitting here!" In similar vein someone replied: "Well, why dont you play us something on the piano?" "All right," said Parratt, and proceeded to play by heart anything of Bach, Beethoven, Mozart or Chopin, the company could suggest, carrying on a varied conversation and calling out his moves whenever they were due. The conversation, the music, and the chess all proceeded impeccably for some time, when suddenly Parratt began a new piece in a *tempo* obviously too fast. The *tempo* became more and more outrageous, until Parratt cried: "I've beaten him!" His next move was "checkmate".'

After seven years of quiet country life, Parratt became organist of Wigan Parish Church, where he did a good work among those warm-hearted people. In 1872 his wider work began. He was appointed organist of Magdalen College, Oxford. He entered fully and with zest, into the life of the University, taking a keen interest in the University Musical Club, and being captain of the Chess Club. After ten years at Oxford, ten full and happy years, the post

* *Walter Parratt, Master of the Music*, by Donald Tovey and Geoffrey Parratt. (Humphrey Milford. Oxford Press. 8/6. 1942.)

of organist of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, fell vacant, and Parratt was appointed, remaining there till his death in 1924. He greatly improved the quality of the singing and of the music.

The organ at Windsor was in a bad state of repair and needed renovation. Parratt accepted the post of organist with the understanding that the organ was to be brought up-to-date. This was done to his satisfaction. But more than the organ needed attention. The *repertoire* of the choir was limited and needed widening. Parratt quickly introduced a greater variety into the music. He would never concentrate on one school of composers, to the detriment of others. The lay clerks at Windsor were another difficulty. Some of them considered that they could do much as they liked.

> 'Matters came to a head one day when a man flatly refused to sing a certain solo. He was promptly marched before The Canon in Residence, fortunately Boyd Carpenter (a good friend to Parratt), and, failing to appreciate the situation, demanded that the anthem should be changed to suit him. He very soon left the choir altogether. After this things rapidly improved . . . '

Parratt was a brilliant organ player and a fine accompanist.

> '. . . in the service of the church he regarded music, not as an end, but as a means of interpretation. In the psalms particularly, the music was subordinate to the words and each psalm's meaning and character were clearly brought out, so that its message could be seen in the faces of the congregation.'

But Parratt did not confine himself to Windsor. He was also Professor of the Organ at The Royal College of Music. Each day he would take the boy's to practice at Windsor at 8.30 a.m., and then dash off to the station to catch the 9.5 train to London. As a teacher he made his mark. Many of his pupils were to become well-known in the world of music. The late Sir Walford Davies, so greatly beloved, was one of his pupils, as also were Dr. Henry Ley, the Precentor of Eton College, and Dr. W. H. Harris, the present organist of St. George's Chapel. As a teacher, his methods were severe. Slovenliness and carelessness were not tolerated. Nothing escaped him. He hated anything smacking of artificiality or conceit. To one pupil, who was a poor player, but was immaculately dressed, he once said:

> '"Sir why don't you play with more expression?" "Do you mean you wish me to use more swell, Sir Walter?" "No Sir, there is enough of that on the organ seat".'

For nearly forty years he trained and sent out pupils, and all this amidst much other work.

In 1892, Parratt was Knighted. In the following year he was made 'Master of the King's Music' a position he held under three monarchs, Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V.

O. R. Clarke.

LIGHT AND COMFORT *

In his introduction to Dr. Raven's *Lessons of the Prince of Peace* (his recommended 'Lent Book' for 1942) the Bishop of London writes that 'its chief concern is to help us to increase in sensitiveness to the many-sided presence of God with man and to reach a deeper intensity of Christian living.' Linnaeus regarded reason as the specific quality of humanity, but its beginnings are plainly traceable in the higher mammals. Bergson suggested craftsmanship as the distinguishing mark; but birds and spiders can equal if not excel us in this. Canon Raven suggests that *Religion* is man's unique and distinguishing attainment, and that 'it is his consciousness of God which is the origin and secret of his manhood.' If this is so, the truly human interpre-

* *Lessons of the Prince of Peace*, by the Rev. C. E. Raven, D.D. (Longmans. 1942. 2/6.)
Things I live by, by the Bishop of Lichfield. (Cambridge University Press. 1942. 6d.)

tation of the world should be in terms of God; all nature becomes a sign and instrument of the divine, all history a record and interpretation of His purpose. Religion then is the mentally unifying activity, the one primary and universal interest. God is 'the supreme reality, the primary object of our striving, the integrative centre of our existence.'

And yet in the case of most of us this is theory only. God may be a name of awe, a synonym for certain inspirations and insights, a refuge, a court of appeal, remotely real, if real at all. But it was the first lesson of the ministry of Jesus to make God immediately real, and He did this in His teaching by associating God with what was *ordinary*.

> 'Jesus continually draws the material of His teaching from the simplest and most commonplace factors in our environment. Men in the past, men of all other religions, have associated their deities with the exceptional and the abnormal; with earthquake and tempest, with calamity and deliverance, with portents and miracles, with great men and heroic events. Jesus does not talk of God in terms of David and Goliath, but of men sowing fields and women baking bread. When he would illustrate the quality of God's Kingdom He does not put forward Moses or Elijah or Judas Maccabaeus, but sets a little child in the midst . . . Common things and common people, in them Jesus discloses His Father. By so doing He demonstrates the universality of God, and the capacity of all nature and all history to reveal Him.'

The Bishop of Truro has recently written that 'The human urge to achievement is best regarded as an element of a cosmic urge.' This would mean that a sense of God and an urge to act would go together and Canon Raven emphatically takes this standpoint. He holds that those who deliberately induce in themselves ecstatic religious experiences and claim that these in themselves possess religious and spiritual value, 'are surely endangering their sanity and denying their responsibilities as men and women.' In the teaching of Jesus,

> 'the practice of the presence of God is inseparable from the doing of His work. We are not called to passivity but to active service; and our worship is not a quietism of contemplation but an inspiration for creative and regenerative effort . . . When the whole self is freed from the wastage of inward conflict and fused in a heat of effort, we discover that infinite resources are available.'

This is insisted upon in the 'mystical Gospel' where one might least expect to find it. 'He that *doeth the will* shall learn of the doctrine;' 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work.' 'Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.' The disciple does not believe first and then act, nor work first and then learn; the secret of his discipleship is the unification of his life in belief and action; he becomes a 'whole' person, one in whom awareness of God becomes an energising influence.

> 'Shortly before his death Dr. John Oman said to me, "When I talk of a Christian, I mean one with whom to see is to act"—and he added rather sadly, "I've only known three such people." Manifestly such people are very rare—or the world would be transformed.'

But if a man will do God's work, he must ask what is the character of God; he needs both a symbol to express that character and an instrument to accomplish that will. Both have been found uniquely in Jesus Christ. He enables us on the one hand 'to put a face on God,' so that God becomes human and alive to us, and also 'enables in us a return of God's likeness—of that original resemblance to God in which we were made.' For in the Christian

> 'Christ lives, not as a memory or as a symbol but as a person with whom he can be and is in contact. In this contact the individual is not

only transformed as he is by every true friendship, so that he becomes (in some degree) what Christ is, but he is harmonised and united with all those who share the same loyalty since the same Christ "lives in" each of them,'

It may well be that this intimate religion of friendship with God through friendship with Christ will become more frequent in days when many have to face their Gethsemane, than was the case in smoother times.

'It may be that those who are now facing the fact of their own deaths — that experience which can neither be imagined nor shared, and which is surely the coming of age of the soul — will recover the sense of the immediacy of the eternal, the knowledge that here and now is enshrined and never wholly concealed a presence which does not change, a reality with which we discover ourselves to be akin. If so, they will learn to live accompanied, gaining from the friendship of God all and more than all they gain from their closest human comrades. This "friendship" carries with it "boldness" of approach and speech which is so characteristic of New Testament religion and so unlike the subservience or sentimentality of later devotion . . .

'Such an attitude towards God carries with it a sense of proportion and perspective towards all the rest of our circumstances. It is not that they cease to matter. Now that they neither terrorise nor absorb us, now that we are not primarily concerned with possessing or exploiting, we can begin to appreciate and enjoy. For some of us it is a startling surprise to find that with the discovery (or gift) of Christ comes also a discovery of all else as well, to observe for the first time the unbelievable beauty and interest of the world, to perceive afresh the worth and pathos of mankind.'

In these addresses we have the learning of the scholar, the clarity of the skilled writer, the insight of the prophet, the warmth of the preacher combined in a manner that is all too rare. They edify the will, stimulate the mind, encourage the heart. One feels that Canon Raven not only has profound learning but also sees into things a good deal more deeply than very many who claim to guide us in these fundamental matters.

The Bishop of Lichfield's six broadcast talks recently given in the series *Lift Up Your Hearts* were warmly appreciated by all sorts and conditions of people, and their publication will be welcome to many who heard them, and also to many who did not. The Bishop has a particular gift for winning confidence and establishing a friendly and receptive attitude amongst those who listen to him. And when one reads these talks one sees that their attraction lay not by any means wholly in the manner of their delivery, but also in their matter, which is full of wisdom, common-sense and sound doctrine. The secret is that the Bishop understands common human nature, its hopes, fears, anxieties, joys, sorrows. *Things I Live By* is the title:

'I don't mean just things we like to do or to have, nor do I mean occupations or possessions which seem to make themselves indispensable. I mean rather things deep down inside us, hard to define but very real: bits of hidden faith or conviction, anchors which won't drag . . .'

'After all, theology is only thought-out religion.'

'For many of us, happiness in work is mixed up with that conviction that God is near us, not just in church but in the midst of the most mundane occupations. "Whatsoever ye do," wrote St. Paul, "do it heartily *as unto the Lord*." That kind of healthy concentration on the job in hand, forgetting yourself but knowing at the back of your mind that the job is worth-while, is a big ingredient in work and happiness. It recalls to my mind the motto of one of my Quaker ancestors: "Be a whole man to one thing at a time."'

J.C.H.

NOTES ON SOME EDUCATIONAL BOOKS

Prayers in Time of Strife, by Michael Bruce. (S.P.C.K. 1/- paper. 1941.)

The author of this book of prayers was on the staff of the S.C.M., and among his duties was that of leading in prayer mixed gatherings of Anglicans and Free Churchmen. These prayers are of his own composition, with this special purpose in view; and who shall blame him if, in being of use for one purpose, they are not of great use for another?

You can apply one great test of value to a printed prayer: will it stand repetition? The analogy with great poetry or music is obvious here. The best of the prayer-book collects will stand up to constant use; they wear well. Few modern prayers do. Then, will the prayer stand reading aloud? Again, the majority of the prayer-book collects are both simple and brief enough for this; they are of use to the unlettered and possibly inattentive, to the beginner as well as to the expert in prayer. It is the most difficult thing in the world (*experto credite*) to compose a prayer which fulfils these conditions. The majority of the prayers in this book, I am afraid, do nothing of the sort. They would be of use to a very attentive gathering of students, and some might like to use them for their private devotions; but for public recitation something much simpler would be wiser.

One or two struck your reviewer as more serviceable than others: two for use before Bible study (21 and 22); prayers for those who have lost homes or possessions (45); for families divided by the war (54); a children's prayer for parents or foster-parents (55); for a departed parish priest (64).

School Services and Prayers, by R. J. Seal. (United Society for Christian Literature, Lutterworth Press. 6*d.*, sewed. 1941.)

This contains twelve assembly services: a service for opening, and one for closing, term; two late evening services, on the lines of compline; a staff service; prayers for special occasions; and graces. The keynote throughout is simplicity, and it is not only the young who need this in their services. The assembly services are perhaps too long for daily use — they make provision for three hymns each service, and the hymns are well chosen for their purpose; but the prayers can easily be used without them, or with one hymn only.

The book is thoroughly recommended to all who have to lead school prayers, whether they use it as a whole or whether they select from it; and if the latter, the selections are likely to be large. Doctrinally the book keeps to the elementary indisputables; and it is full of good ideas, such as the use, as a spoken prayer, of the lovely words from the Sarum Primer of 1558, 'God be in my head,' set to music by Sir Walford Davies in the familiar anthem.

The Riches of our Prayer Book, by J. P. Hodges. (S.P.C.K. 1/6 paper. A publication of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, 1941.)

There is a Foreword by the Bishop of Truro, who hopes that the book will be of special use in connection with Confirmation classes and Study Circles. It will certainly be of great help to those who can use it so. It is attractively written, full of good stories and apt illustration, sometimes thrown in as asides to the main theme of the conversation. It stresses the fact that our prayer-book is essentially the layman's book; it was so in origin, and has remained almost the only book of its sort so produced. On p. 104, 'index Purgatorium' should read 'Index Expurgatorius.' Mr. Hodges is well known as a competent and influential Parish Priest, and this little book offers to its readers some of the fruits of his practical wisdom. The book is well printed on good paper.

Follow the Christ: Lessons for Young People aged 12 to 14, by Elsie E. Boden, B.A., N.F.U. (Lutterworth Press. 5/-. 1941.)

A collection of twenty-six studies, each on a single theme — Ambition, Guidance, and so on — and containing material for one lesson; each study is

preceded by suggestions for hymns, Bible reading, acts of worship, and prayers, including suggestions for leading silent prayer. They are the fruit of practical experience in Sunday schools, and will be of obvious help to those engaged on similar work. The book is just the thing to put into the hands of a not-too-skilled teacher who is liable to be short of ideas.

The connection between the Bible passage chosen and the lesson to follow is careful and close; and each lesson leads up to the teaching of Jesus on the subject for discussion. On p. 79 it is a mistake to treat the Daniel story as literal truth. Perhaps just a few more references would have made the book even more valuable. To find the footnote 'Weymouth' only, as the apparent answer to the question in the text, 'Rabbi, where are you going?' (p. 35) is a little disconcerting.

The book is rather expensive at the price; the paper and printing are distinctly war-time, and there are only 160 pages. W. H. OLDAKER.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

PEACE RECONSTRUCTION AND POPULATION PLANNING.

SIR,

Your article on Population-Planning in the current issue is misleading. In common with others you accept or even welcome declining numbers with the excuse that 'it is the quality of the world's population, not its quantity, which is of prime importance in the interest of real human progress.'

The two cannot be separated. Most of the great men in every walk of life have been younger sons, not least of the manse. You will get a better cricket eleven and a better selection of talent in a school of 500 than in one of 50.

You take refuge in the economic fallacy of 'excessive fertility in nations not capable of providing more than a bare level of subsistence.' What nations are these? Malthus wrote at the turn of the eighteenth century, in a period of war when our population was under nine million. It is now 42 million and the standard of living has increased beyond belief. This war is again teaching us how much more of the necessities of life we can produce if we try. India, under British guidance, has developed vast areas by irrigation-schemes. There are vast areas in the world, not least in the British Empire, available for development, many of them of highest fertility in past ages.

As Malthus later modestly reflected: 'Having found the bow bent too much one way, I was induced to bend it too much the other in order to make it straight.' Human progress now demands that we check the declining fertility in the progressive nations that are pledged to defend Christian civilisation. We want every man and woman we can get, and must make proper provision for them.

FRANCIS FREMANTLE.

Bedwell Park,
Hatfield, Herts.
May 27th, 1942.

[In our editorial, 'Peace, Reconstruction and Population Planning' in our May issue, we stressed the need for scientific population planning as an important factor in world welfare and world peace. We cannot imagine that our correspondent denies the need for scientific population planning. The plans for implementing it are secondary, and experts in this as in so many other cases are not agreed.

We infer from our correspondent's letter that he holds the number of eugenic children in a large family will be greater not only *actually* but also *proportionately* than in a small family. In other words, the quality of children in large families is superior to the quality of children in smaller families. We had thought that vital statistics are against this conclusion.

We also infer that our correspondent holds the view that first-born children are less eugenic than those born after them in a family. Is the evidence for this any more convincing than for the popular view that bastards possess exceptional vitality and vigour?—Ed. *M.C.*]

Sir,

DOCTORS AND PARSONS.

As chaplain of a big hospital and infirmary, I am interested in the article 'Doctors and Parsons.' I am in no sense a psychologist, and merely do my work as a simple Parish Priest; and in my relationship with the staff, try to remember that the patients are there not primarily for religious and spiritual strength and consolation, but for medical and surgical treatment. The arrangement works tolerably well and many opportunities, direct and indirect come our way. If I were to approach my work as a psychologist, I can picture some grim clashes, and I doubt very much whether the last state would not be a good deal worse than the first. The ordinary man in the street does not want the padre to be 'too religious'—he wants a sympathetic but manly fellow who can be relied upon to mix up his praying with kindly and charitable exercises. For instance, during one of the most violent blitzes, I was able to go around all the wards making enquiries for matron to see if everything was 'in order.' Not a very priestly job, but one of the most permanently useful I have been allowed to do. It got me into a different kind of relationship with all kinds of people.

The Roman Catholic Priest has his ministrations and his 'last rights' and *in extremis* duties. We have not—in quite the same sense. This makes a permanent difference in our *status*. That should be recognised, whether it is to be regretted or not will be judged differently, according to different ecclesiastical outlooks. Regrettable or not it is a fact which reflects right through our work.

The article referred to does not, however, make any reference directly to the duty of preparing patients for their end. The policy in the medical world to-day seems to be to tell everyone that they are getting better in all circumstances. Right up to the hour of their departure patients say, 'Yes, I'm better'—and the clergy are expected to acquiesce in the fiction. Seldom do we really have the opportunity of facing out the facts. Only once can I remember an old lady telling me exactly what was wrong with her—that her end was coming in a few weeks. She was determined to be strong and cheerful, and would I help her. That was one of the most beautiful experiences I can remember, right to the end. I believe it is a great tragedy that we are denied this privilege in a great number of cases where the patient would be strong enough to bear it, and where it would give great comfort to the relations: quite apart from the fact that I believe it is our duty as Priests.

On the other hand one can see clearly that if the patient were once allowed to give up the fight, all would be lost.

I believe many clergy would like some expert advice on this subject.

The Vicarage, Bournville. Gilbert Molesworth.

[We venture the three following comments:—

(1) Bishop Jeremy Taylor wrote in his *Holy Dying*: 'the lessons of how to die well are best learnt by men in health.'

(2) Bedside prayer is better than direct conversation. Prayer admits of greater freedom, greater intimacy, and a more spiritual treatment of the matter. Prayer with and for the patient should seek to remove any sense of unexpressed fear and should aim at securing the sense of pardon and peace and a firm trust in the Divine Love and Presence.

> 'Though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me.'

Without encouraging false hopes, prayer should also include the conviction that the 'prayer of faith' can be a means, if it be God's will, of restoration to health.

(3) The Sacrament should not be directly pressed upon the patient by the clergyman lest it should create a sense of alarm. Relations and nurses can best act as intermediaries in this matter.—Ed. *M.C.*]

COUNTRY PARSONS AND THEIR PROBLEMS.

Sir,

The problem of the country parson is simply an intrinsic part of the larger problem: the English village. As H. J. Massingham has written:

> 'Peasant, yeoman, craftsman, labourer, squire and parson have been what may be called basic England, and all of them have been separated from the soil.'

The parson has lost his spiritual authority, and the squire his personal responsibility in the conduct of rural life. All manner of bureaucratic systems and mechanical powers have usurped the functions of personal leadership formerly entrusted to these two figures. A rebirth of rural England means a rebirth of leadership as well as security for farmer, craftsman and labourer. How is this rebirth to be brought about?

I have elsewhere suggested that we must win a new conception of estates as co-operative centres of rural activity and as pivots of regional development; the estate must be the power-centre, at which the current of rural vitality is generated, the bottle-neck of all processing and marketing, the co-ordinating factor in rural industry and adult education. But if this is not to become a secular growth unhallowed by spiritual motives, religious leadership must come alive at the heart of such activity. Worship must be reconnected to work, thanksgiving to effort and prayer, unite the common endeavour and integrate each home and heart.

We want young priests in rural England, not the elderly clergymen. We want priests who will farm their own glebe and set an example in husbandry and earth-lore to their fellow farmers, or be craftsmen among craftsmen and artisans. Even if it be but through the running of a herb garden, the parson should be a mint of knowledge and wisdom about plants and soils. He should be an authority on Nature. And through being an authority on Nature, he should be an authority on God. A sermon on husbandry or the simple lessons of seedtime and harvest may be very fine; but how much more powerful will be the teaching of one who knows the minute secrets of the Creation and is himself a healer of earth.

Perhaps the first thing will be to close the musty old theological colleges and to open new centres of training and initiation which will have agriculture as their matrix: a new type of Cistercian monastery. This is a *sine qua non* of reform and it must be radical and absolute.

Next, the vicarage must become a farm-house, or centre of crafts and apprenticeships: it must assume economic functions and be a school of practical knowledge, an example to the whole village of the well-balanced rural life.

Instead of three or more worthy but perfunctory services on Sunday, let there be one short service (in addition to the early Communion service), perhaps Mattins and Evensong on alternate Sundays, to which *everyone*, literally everyone is willing to come. And let this service be a full, joyous act of worship with fine music and singing in which trained choir, instrumentalists and congregation each have their parts. Sweep out the pews and let all but the elderly move in procession, stand and kneel, and make the Churches temples of praise and thanksgiving. Let the services rhyme with the seasonal festivals of the year: Harvest Thanksgiving is really the only service, apart from weddings and funerals, which has genuine vital appeal to the English countryman to-day. Let the address be short and direct, with reference to the real human problems of the community, a frank dealing with common issues and difficulties. And let the readings and prayers be read by laymen, members of the congregation, so that they participate to the maximum extent in the shaping of services.

We are moving into that chapter of Christianity which is the realm of the Holy Spirit. Which means that the grace of God is diffused and quickened in the hearts of ordinary men and women. The age of the pulpit-parson is over. The tedious thumping of the ethical table, the mumbo-jumbo of over-elaborate ritual, the dreary bleating of the parsonic voice and the gabbling of innumerable prayers and collects, surely all this caricature of the priestly office should disappear. We want priests who have the skill of craftsmanship and husbandry, and who *know* the truth about life and death, who have occult wisdom and can tell, not because they have been told, but because they remember the soul's experiences. And we want to develop the priestly instinct in all men and women. This requires discipline, a discipline not merely of the mind but of all the faculties. We want in fact a whole religion, not a scriptural teaching. Can the Church of England embrace the task? ROLF GARDINER.

[We are grateful to our correspondent and recognise that he presents an ideal which deserves serious attention from those responsible for the spiritual and moral welfare of our country parishes. We venture on several comments.

Country people are very conservative and very shy. To get them to read the scriptures publicly and lead in prayer — even to walk in processions — would be no easy matter, and would, we fear, subject to local criticism those who took part in these unaccustomed practices. In small country parishes, the level of education, literary and musical, visualised by Mr. Gardiner, could not be reached without prolonged training by an accomplished, attractive, and very tactful clergyman, or by a layman possessed of the quality of Dr. Bridges and his devoted wife.

We are sure that it would be a mistake for the parson to farm his glebe. If he did it badly, he would be laughed at. If he did it well, it would bring him into competition with his parishioners in the local markets. We have known cases where this has caused resentment. That a country parson should look after his flower garden, kitchen garden and orchard, meets with local approval; but he must stop short of farming.

It seems to us that the parson's duties in the country, as in town, are that he should be:—

(1) The leader in Divine Worship and make his Church in every way suitable for that purpose.

(2) That he should be a Christian educationalist.

(3) That he should be a unifying social influence — the friend of all, and their servant when they need his assistance.

(4) That he should be ready to lead in times of local crisis in his community.

Whether he ought to spend some time in an Agricultural College during his time of preparation for Holy Orders we doubt. Farmers do not like 'theory' and do not like a parson who thinks he knows as much or more about farming than they do.

We doubt also whether young priests would work in many of our rural parishes. Middle-aged and married men with families and possessed of country tastes acquired before ordination, seem to us more likely to carry weight with rural people.

There have to be services at a variety of times in a country Church on Sunday. The members of a household can only attend services at different times.

The re-birth of rural England bristles with problems, especially if it be intended to make rural Russia our model; but this is outside our sphere. Meanwhile in trying to improve the quality of his service, the country parson should be prepared — especially in consultation with his Parochial Church Council — to make experiments. We are glad to publish accounts of such experiments.— Ed. M.C.]

MR. PRESTON AND THE MALVERN CONFERENCE.

SIR,

If space permitted I would ask Mr. Ronald Preston some questions concerning (*a*) the nature of science, (*b*) the standing of economics as a science, (*c*) the criteria by which 'economic norms' are established and the relation of those norms to economic considerations. I will content myself with saying that if Mr. Preston will emerge from his shelter of vague generalisation, and make some definite statement as to why he considers my diagnosis a false account of what goes on, I shall be happy to give his arguments whatever treatment they may seem to deserve.

I perceive his difficulty in believing that any of the Malvern writers could be aware of the existence of an 'orthodox' diagnosis, and at the same time dismiss it as inadequate. Incredible as it may seem, this has actually happened.

45 Castleman Mansions, S.W.13. W. G. PECK.

[I had three criticisms to make of Mr. Peck's paper. The first was that if he had discriminated between different kinds of collectivism, I think it could be shown that certain forms of social control are close to what the Christian doctrine of man indicates is necessary, namely a check on the use of power. Secondly I thought he had overlooked the really important point about the 'autonomous' economic system, in exposing its abuses, but it does stress consumer's choice, a principle which I think is important to preserve. Lastly I held that his analysis of money and an unpurchasable surplus on pp. 26-28, on which much of his paper depends, is untrue, and that a more accurate account of the circulation of money in the monetary system has been given by recent monetary theory. This is a precise technical point; if he rejects 'orthodoxy' on this point, it seems to me he must do so on economic not theological grounds. Yet I suggested that it was rather that he started from a view of natural law which denies economics the right to exist. It is around this that I think the issue lies (and it involves the three points at the beginning of his letter). Whatever the answer to them is, I cannot see how as a theologian he can produce an analysis on points like the one I objected to.

RONALD PRESTON.]